

May 19, 1975

SENATOR DICKINSON: I had two booklets about this thick on the plant science, Senator Koch, but it's a valid point and I won't argue about it. How about if the Game and Parks Commission is not going to be responsible for a maintenance funding, then would not the organization you mentioned, I can't remember the initials, which is basically made up of school districts in the Eastern Nebraska and Western Iowa area, would they not be responsible for maintaining ... it's going to cost money to maintain a recreational area.

SENATOR KOCH: Senator Dickinson, may I quote to you exactly the last paragraph of the amendment? It says, "the Game and Parks Commission may enter into agreements or leases with subdivisions of government or non-profit corporations for the operation and development of property for recreational and educational purposes. The Commission, however, shall be responsible for the general administration and continuing maintenance of such property; may accept gifts, grants and bequests for such purposes." Now I anticipate that if the non-profit corporation I speak of, the Metropolitan Education Programs Agency, when we draw the contract on this that we will be responsible to maintain the property. When we talk about recreational types of activities they can also be recreational and educational in nature. You know it as well as I do. There is sometimes a very fine line between recreation and education in terms of what you attempt to do in obtaining some objectives.

SENATOR DICKINSON: It appears to me, from of the statements again made by Senators Bereuter and Syas, that recreation has a broad meaning. It's far beyond what the original intent of the association that you refer to that wants to develop this for basically education. Somebody is going to have to maintain it. It's either going to be us by appropriating funds from the State Game Commission, or it's going to be us meaning you and I and all the rest of the people that live in our area maintaining it through increase, for two reasons, in local property tax. One by virtue of the fact you're taking taxable property off the tax rolls. Secondly, you're going to have to tax the remaining property to maintain the area. This seems rather obvious. These are I think valid reasons for opposing the acquisition of this land.

PRESIDENT: Senator Cope.

SENATOR COPE: Mr. President, members. A question of Senator Koch. A point of clarification. When I asked, a while ago, about the \$750,000 purchase price you said \$650,000. I understood that this was to be paid by the state and now, after talking to you, I understand that this is from the federal government. Would you explain? I want to know specifically.

SENATOR KOCH: Yes. Very specifically, Senator Cope, our anticipated plan is as follows -- that we would obtain a grant from the federal government from one of the sources mentioned by Senator Bereuter and myself earlier. The amount would be \$675,000 in order to acquire 657 acres of land. In turn the Gifford's will donate 926 acres of land with an appraised value of a little over a million dollars. That would be the match that we would have to have